

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, January 9, 1991

The House met at 12 noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 9, 1991.

I hereby designate the Honorable G.V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

THOMAS S. FOLEY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

The hearts of people everywhere, O God, cry for peace and justice in our world. From many voices, young and old, from many lands and cultures, people pray that the terror of war may be put aside and that the present fear may be overcome by hope. May our abhorrence of hostility encourage each of us to do justice, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with You. Hear our prayer, O God. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CAMP] will please come forward and lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CAMP led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. McCathran, one of his secretaries.

FMLN GUERRILLAS ATTEMPT TO KILL U.S. INVESTIGATORS

(Mr. SHUSTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, we have just learned that FMLN guerrillas in El Salvador have attempted to kill the eight U.S. Army investigators who were sent down there to investigate the murder of our U.S. Army helicopter crew last week. When our eight U.S. investigators were exiting the site of the atrocity, six FMLN guerrillas opened fire on them, attempting to murder them.

I think this clearly demonstrates once again that the FMLN Communist guerrillas are brutal killers. They are not interested in peace in El Salvador but, rather, in replacing the duly elected democratic government with a Marxist dictatorship. Hopefully, those Americans who have given aid and comfort and indeed financial support to the FMLN Communist guerrillas in El Salvador will rethink their position based on this additional evidence of this attempt by these brutal killers to kill U.S. servicemen.

PUBLIC OPINION SUPPORTS CONTINUING SANCTIONS, REJECTS WAR

(Mr. SANDERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, based on four public hearings that I have held in the State of Vermont, and based on the mail and the telephone calls that my office is receiving, it is my belief that the people of Vermont are overwhelmingly convinced that the crisis in the Persian Gulf can be resolved in a nonviolent manner through the continuation of strong economic sanctions against Iraq—sanctions which are rapidly destroying the Iraqi economy and Saddam Hussein's war making capabilities.

As it happens I share those beliefs, and am convinced that at a time when this Nation has a \$3 trillion debt and is looking at the largest deficit in its history; has a banking system on the verge of collapse; a health care system no longer working for ordinary Americans; an educational system which is underfunded and failing; an industrial and manufacturing base which is rapidly becoming second or third rate compared to Japan and Europe—it is my belief that a war in the Persian

Gulf now, an absolutely unnecessary war, would be a terrible mistake that this country would regret for decades to come.

Mr. Speaker, one of the concerns that I have had throughout this entire discussion on the Persian Gulf is that the President has refused to be straightforward with the American people and answer some of the tough questions that millions of Americans are asking. Later this afternoon, in 5-minute remarks, I hope to raise some of those questions—questions relating to potential casualties, the potential cost of such a war, and the nature of or relationship with such feudalistic dictatorships as Saudi Arabia and Kuwait.

SUPPORT URGED FOR WINDFALL PROFIT TAX ON OIL COMPANIES

(Mr. CONTE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, while belts are tightening across the country and our constituents are scraping the coins at the bottom of their wallets to pay the heating bill, the oil merchants are filling their 10-gallon hats to the brim with cash.

Need convincing? Look at Chevron's release that their fourth quarter earnings would be around \$700 million. A \$2 per share dividend.

And look at the recent Department of Energy report which surveyed 17 major oil and gas producers and found their third quarter profits up 685 percent over 1989. During that very same quarter, almost half-a-million Americans lost their jobs.

It's a scandal, but we can stop it right now. Cosponsor my windfall profit tax, and do your part to keep the greedy oil companies honest.

THE OVERRIDING ISSUE FACING CONGRESS MUST BE THE GULF, BUT DOMESTIC PROBLEMS DEMAND AND DESERVE ATTENTION

(Mr. MAZZOLI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, the situation in the Middle East grows more tense and more ominous as the January 15 deadline for the Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait approaches.

I am pleased that my colleagues and I here in Congress will have the opportunity to debate and discuss the role of the United States in the Middle East later this week.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

I am further pleased that the House has a range of resolutions before it including resolutions urging the continued enforcement of economic sanctions against Iraq while diplomatic efforts to solve the impasse continue. Resolutions I support.

To resolutions giving the President some sort of vague, open-ended authority to take offensive action against Iraq: Resolutions about which I have reservations.

I also believe, however, that the crisis in the gulf should not serve to distract the Congress, the administration, and the Nation from addressing pressing domestic concerns as well.

The other day, the President used the "R" word, the dreaded "R" word: Recession.

The Nation is in recession. There is widespread unemployment around the country. These domestic issues—housing, homelessness, unemployment, health insurance, and our Nation's crumbling infrastructure, to name a few—need to be addressed by Congress despite our preoccupation with the gulf crisis.

DISTURBING DEVELOPMENTS IN THE BALTICS

(Mr. LEACH of Iowa asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LEACH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express the deepest concern about new Soviet interventions in the Baltic States.

Whatever the gravity of events in the Persian Gulf or elsewhere, the current government in Moscow must understand that the American people will not allow themselves to be diverted from our historic identification with the Baltic peoples and the just cause of Baltic independence.

The United States stands unequivocally for the individual rights of minority groups within the Soviet Union. We can do no less for the collective national rights of the Baltic Republics.

Without brash bluster or meek equivocation, this Congress must leave no doubt that America's deepening rapprochement with Soviet Russia is inevitably jeopardized by new Muscovite coercion in the Baltics. Soviet troops have no business in Vilnius, no right to seize television studios or coerce parliaments. Democracy and self-determination are principles that must be respected as universal, not selective. They are the linchpins of justice in this regard.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress has no choice but to identify in the starkest way possible with the common fate of the Baltic peoples, who appear to be living under a new reign of Stalinist-style terror.

□ 1210

UNDATED DECLARATION OF WAR A DANGEROUS PRECEDENT

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, The President of the United States yesterday requested that we provide him with an undated declaration of war. I feel that voting for such a blank check is a very, very dangerous precedent for this body, that really will only make it into a rubberstamp in the future, and I certainly hope we do not do that.

But for those who are very anxious to join the President in giving him this authority to commit American troops whenever he wants to combat, let me remind them there is even more they can do. Forty-seven years ago, Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., resigned from the Senate, saying in his letter to his colleagues that the fact that the United States was entering a period of large-scale ground fighting gave him the definite conclusion that he felt that he should join and serve his country as a combat soldier. He was not only willing to vote, he was willing to go.

For those who are that anxious, I hope they consider ex-Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.'s plea.

CONGRESS SHOULD GRANT VOTE OF CONFIDENCE TO PRESIDENT

(Mr. GEKAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, now is the time for the Congress of the United States to grant a vote of confidence to the President of the United States. After all, the entire world in one way or another through the United Nations, through individual consultations, has granted that confidence to the President of the United States. Our Armed Forces in the desert of Saudi Arabia has given a vote of confidence to the President of the United States time and time again. The American people, in poll after poll, in a substantial majority, has indicated their confidence in the President of the United States.

What a shame it would be, it would be an utter betrayal, if the Congress of the United States would fail to grant that vote of confidence in the President of the United States.

This is the time to rally around the President. It is the right thing to do. It expresses to the American people that we cannot abide by the aggression of Iraq, and that the will of the United States and the international community will be done. Vote for the resolution supporting the President of the United States.

LET US NOT JUMP THE GUN ON WAR IN THE MIDDLE EAST

(Mr. MCCLOSKEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, so much faith, perhaps unjustly, is put in polls. But as we stand on the verge of war in the Middle East, hopefully common sense and conscience will prevail over any polls. In my ad hoc de facto coffee shop and court house polling, conservative Hoosiers overwhelmingly reject any need to go to war in the Middle East at this time. My congressional mail has been running 10 to 1 against any offensive launch.

Yet national polls show a slim majority of American people willing to back an offensive war. However, support falls to just 44 percent with 1,000 casualties and to 35 percent with 10,000 casualties.

Although some highly placed congressional leaders think we will be in and out of this like a Grenada holiday, the odds are that our casualties will be in the tens of thousands.

As Admiral Crowe has said, "What is the rush?" The sanctions are working. Are the problems of jobs, productivity, health care, deficit reduction, the environment, and a truly peaceful new world order not more important than jumping the gun in the sands of the Middle East?

ENCOURAGE SURVIVAL OF SMALL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

(Mr. DUNCAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, we are all concerned about the failure of the Bank of New England and the shaky condition of our Nation's banks and savings and loan associations. However, it seems to me that we are attempting to solve this problem in exactly the wrong way.

It appears that the prevailing sentiment of the regulators is to merge the weak institutions into the larger and larger organizations. What we really need is a large number of small, conservatively run institutions. We would be better off with several thousand small banks, or several hundred small banks at least, rather than a few big ones. If one big institution fails us in New England, that is a major catastrophe for the taxpayers, where it would not be as great a problem if the institution were small.

Highly regulated industries, those in which there is much governmental interference, always end up with a very small number of very large companies controlling the market. On the other hand, when the free market is allowed to operate, the little man has a chance. This can be seen in the trucking industry, where there was a major deregula-

tion several years ago. Now there are thousands of small independent trucking companies, and there will be, until the regulators and the bureaucrats take over and run the small companies out.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we will not let the same thing happen with the banks and savings and loans, and not let the regulators run the small financial institutions out of existence in this country.

PATIENCE IN PURSUIT OF WORLD PEACE

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I earnestly hope and pray that the negotiations that are now going on in Geneva will be successful. This world does not need another war. We need a peaceful solution.

Mr. Speaker, I want to support the President of the United States in that effort. But I will not vote for a blank check as a declaration of war, as was done here in 1964 in the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. It would be a mistake for the Congress to vote that kind of resolution through here again. All of us know the sad history of what happened there.

But it is important for us at this time to remain firm in our convictions, that we will resist aggression. It is important that we remain firm in our enforcement of the embargo that we have. I think with that firmness and that patience, we can successfully conclude this very strenuous session that we are now going through.

INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY MUST SUPPORT GULF EFFORT

(Mr. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons support is eroding for our Persian Gulf policy in the country is allied contributions. Our constituents are not pleased with what our allies are doing in this effort.

Japan's trivial contribution of half of a billion dollars is just a fraction of the amount Sony paid for Columbia Records. Germany's contribution probably is comparable to the payroll of the Oakland Athletics.

What about our French colleagues? At the time that the Secretary of State is trying to negotiate an agreement, the last chance for peace, France launches its own peace initiative that will hardly help Secretary Baker's efforts. Who knows what this peace agreement is? Where was the consultation?

Mr. Speaker, Saudi Arabia, our friend, is placing restrictions on American troops on religious practices and other potentially eroding moral incentives.

Mr. Speaker, we have to make sure that this is not an American war, but that this involves the Western World. We have to protect Western interests. What we are having now with attitudes by the French, the Germans, the Japanese, and others, is that it is strictly an American war, and they want us to do the dirty work.

ALL PEACEFUL MEANS OF ACHIEVING U.S. OBJECTIVES MUST BE UNDERTAKEN

(Mr. MARKEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, today Secretary of State Baker and Iraqi Foreign Minister Tariq Aziz are meeting in Geneva. The whole world is watching to see whether this meeting brings about a peaceful solution to the gulf crisis.

But if it does not, the Congress of the United States will have to consider whether or not to authorize the use of military force to drive Iraq from Kuwait.

In 1965, President Johnson asked Congress to adopt the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, giving him a blank check to send combat troops to fight in Vietnam. Today, President Bush is asking Congress to pass a "Gulf of Persia" resolution giving him a blank check to plunge America into a war with Iraq.

The President has said that anything less than approval of a blank check authorizing "all means necessary" to drive Saddam from Kuwait would encourage Iraqi intransigence and detract from the international coalition arrayed against Iraq.

I disagree. Before Congress authorizes the President to send young American men and women to fight and die, we must know that all peaceful means of achieving U.S. objectives have failed. Why should we go to war, when continued application of economic sanctions may be able to drive Iraq from Kuwait without firing a shot?

The Bush administration should give economic sanctions more time to work and assure there is true burden sharing, not phoney burden shirking on the part of our coalition partners. The administration must forge a national energy independence strategy that eliminates our overdependence on foreign oil and a principled nuclear nonproliferation policy that keeps countries such as Iraq from obtaining access to the bomb.

That is what America needs to do. Instead of passing blank checks for war, we must devote our full energies to putting together a strategy for peace

so that young American men and women will not be asked unnecessarily to give "the last full measure of their devotion" on the battlefield.

□ 1220

UNITED STATES SHOULD NOT GO TO WAR WITH IRAQ

(Mr. DEFAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, we have been told that the President, Secretary of State Baker, have decided to go an extra mile in the attempt to resolve this disagreement peaceably. They are not going the extra mile, they are going the first mile in diplomacy.

This is the first attempt at diplomacy before the rush to war of this administration. We are going to be asked to support the President with an open-ended authorization to pursue a war. If we are going to do that, then let us just have an honest vote up or down on a declaration of war here on the floor of the House.

Why the rush to war? Mr. Webster, the head of the CIA, said sanctions are working. Is it because the President and his staff are so embarrassed that they opposed economic sanctions against Iraq 10 days before the invasion? Is it because Ambassador Gillespie 3 days before the invasion left open the door to invasion and mollified, attempted to placate Mr. Hussein?

There is no long term vision on the part of this administration. How are we going to achieve long term peace and stability in the Persian Gulf? It is not through a war against Iraq.

SUNDRY DEFERRALS OF BUDGET AUTHORITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 102-24)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I herewith report two new deferrals and four revised deferrals by budget authority now totaling \$9,093,864,337.

The deferrals affect International Security Assistance programs, as well as programs of the Departments of Agriculture, State and Transportation.

The details of these deferrals are contained in the attached report.

GEORGE BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 9, 1991.

A LESSON FROM HISTORY ABOUT SADDAM HUSSEIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I repeat that the duty of the Congress of the United States in these perilous times is to, within reason, rally around the President of the United States and his objectives, especially in the field of foreign policy. When we look at the geopolitical situation that prevails historically, there is no other choice but for the United States to lead in the repulsion of the aggression that has been instituted by Iraq against its neighbor.

It is important that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD contain allusions to history as we begin the debate on the Persian Gulf. Why are there so many of us who feel the pressure of history and say that we must resist this aggression now before it becomes worse? Is there any precedent for being able to say that it could become worse?

I refer to the 1930's. As a newsboy I remember the headlines in 1938. I was in downtown Harrisburg, and the headline read, "Sudetenland Taken Over by Hitler," or some words to that effect.

What had happened was in March 1938 Adolf Hitler, the dictator of Germany—recall we are talking about a dictator today in Saddam Hussein, autocratic, self-appointed dictator—back in 1938 Adolf Hitler, a self-appointed dictator of that regime, took over the Sudetenland on the pretext, and here is where history comes into play, on the pretext that the Sudetenland residents, largely German, pleaded with him to be reunited with the motherland, so to speak, with Germany. So on the basis of some ethnic connection with the Sudetenland, Hitler marched in and took over that portion of Czechoslovakia.

In 1990 what happened is Iraq marches into Kuwait on some pretext that this was an ethnic connection that always existed historically, and that he, Saddam Hussein, had the right to incorporate Kuwait as the 19th province of Iraq.

What that similarity does is warn us of what is happening.

What happened then? In the summer of 1938 intense negotiations were going on. The entire world was worried about this naked aggression on the part of Adolf Hitler. What did they do about it? They met with him in France, England did, and in September 1938 as the Prime Minister of England returned home, in front of 10 Downing Street in London he pronounced peace in our time because he and the French Foreign Minister had granted to Hitler his request that he keep the Sudetenland. That is all he wanted, just a little bit of Czechoslovakia, no other aggression was in the books, and they could go home and recognize that no more ag-

gression would be perpetrated by Adolf Hitler.

It was not very long when he marched into Czechoslovakia. Anschluss took place with Austria, and then in September 1939 the world knows what happened, naked aggression, blitzkrieg into Poland, and then belatedly the Western allies, England and France, declared war on Germany when it was almost too late. It was too little and it was almost too late. And if it were not for the United States of America in standing by the side of Western civilization and of democracy, World War II could not have been won. The aggressor, Adolf Hitler, could not have been put down.

Those parallels are very important. Here we have Saddam Hussein with a stranglehold, potential stranglehold on the Middle East affecting our economy, the entire civilized world, and if this aggression prevails on Kuwait he can further his efforts to strangle the lifelines of Western civilization.

□ 1230

He must be stopped now before the Sudetenland of 1938 is repeated in the Kuwait of 1990, and the too little, too late efforts of the Allies during the 1939 cycle must not be repeated in 1991.

That is why we must support the President of the United States in every effort from embargo to diplomatic and political efforts, settlement, Arab League, League of Nations, United Nations, and I am sorry, the League of Nations failed to do its job before; the United Nations, whatever is required, but the President must be given the vote of confidence by the Congress of the United States.

GROWING THREAT AGAINST BALTIC STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with my colleagues in the House of Representatives in expressing my deep concern about the growing threat of Soviet totalitarianism in the Baltic States of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia.

In recent days we've seen a steady deterioration of the situation there with the takeover by Soviet troops of the largest printing plant in Latvia. Two groups of 10,000 Soviet troops also were recently dispatched to Lithuania and Latvia to round up young men for service in the Soviet military. A total of nearly 100,000 Soviet troops are now based in the region.

Such displays of imperial arrogance have shown me that the Soviet leadership is determined to turn back the recent moves these countries have made toward independence.

I fear these moves foreshadow a still tougher crackdown against the citizens of these Baltic nations who have sought nothing more than the right to determine their own future.

To address this threat to the sovereign peoples of the Baltic Republics, I and several of my colleagues have signed a letter urging President George Bush to make the cause of Baltic independence a cornerstone of United States-Soviet foreign policy.

We must send a clear message to Mikhail Gorbachev that he is jeopardizing United States-Soviet ties by refusing to respect the rights of the Baltic peoples to self-determination.

LESSONS TO BE LEARNED FROM CENTRAL AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, last week when the House convened for the first time, that is, the Congress convened for the first time and organized, we were under the impression that we would adjourn until January 23. Then it was announced late in the day that there would be pro forma meetings on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays until January 23. Then this Monday, while at home, we found out that the intention was to have a unanimous-consent request day before yesterday in order to have a Thursday session and a Friday vote on some type of resolution with respect to the intervention in the Middle East.

The record will show that I have spoken out since we came back after Labor Day in the last Congress. I have introduced a resolution pursuant to the 1973 War Powers Limitation Act in which I wanted to have a hearing by the proper committee in order that the Congress would respect the integrity of its own laws and would, in view of the fact that the clear and limpid intention of the 1973 War Powers Limitation Act was the exact case now unfolding before us since August 3 and, like no other Presidential excursion and adventure, this was precisely what those of us who cosponsored and helped co-author the 1973 act had in mind effective in 1974. The President vetoed it, and we overrode his veto.

When it was announced that the purpose of this Friday's vote was intended to do something that, in effect, would amount to not calling the President to account for violating the very laws that the Congress has passed or at least be summoned to the Congress, rather than having the leaders of the Congress abjectly trail over to the White House to get their marching orders, totally abdicating the constitutional premise in which this body, the Congress, as set forth in article I of the Constitution was clearly intended to act and charged with the responsibility to act and in behalf of the national interest and in behalf of the basic American constitutional premise of the separation of powers, the coequality, the independence and that separation.

So I am totally dismayed, because I might say by way of explanation, and even though I have placed these documents in the RECORDS since September and October, I will not seek to replace them and reprint them and entail that cost at this time, but I will just refer to the fact that as soon as the President announced precipitously and with apparently no consultation whatsoever with the Congress, after his visit over the weekend upon the adjournment of the Congress in August, his announced intention to send Armed Forces of the United States to Saudi Arabia, I wrote a letter to the Speaker. That is all I could do as one individual Member of the House. I urged him to meet with the majority leader of the Senate and call back the Congress in order to obtain consultation, obtain an explanation from the President. I feared, and let me say that up to now, I have had confirmation, not rebuttal, of that fear, that this would simply be a reenactment or an attempted reenactment of our invasion of Panama in December 1989, and it has turned out to be.

Why do I say that? Because there is no thought whatsoever given to the nature and the after effect of the consequences of an invasion.

In Panama, for instance, we are in occupation of that country. Our military are governing it. We have over 10,000 of our military there in occupation running the government, and we dare not remove those soldiers, because I will assure the Members, my colleagues, not one American life will be safe.

We heard earlier some speakers refer to the occurrences in El Salvador, the smallest country in Central America. After \$6 billion and 10 years, we are no closer to any kind of what anybody in his right mind would call a successful conclusion. As a matter of fact, we are worse off. We find now that our military now openly are involved in what we had been saying was happening since 1980, and, mind you, that was the first time I spoke out on Latin America, and it was not President Reagan, it was President Carter. I predicted then, I said, "You cannot militarily determine the outcome of a purely native indigenous civil war." This is not an imposed insurrection by external forces, either Cuban or Russian.

I said the same thing about the Nicaraguan revolution.

So comes Panama. Nobody said we were in there to put down communism, for Noriega was one of our stalwart allies for a while in attempting to promote the so-called Contras, in trying to knock out the Sandinista regime. It was when he doublecrossed us that we then decided that we could not keep him on a payroll that was in excess of what we pay our own President.

Let us now look at Panama. We are still there. We dare not remove our troops. We installed a so-called govern-

ment by swearing in Endara at our military base. Is that democracy? Is that imposing democracy?

We dare not remove our troops that are now in excess of 10,000 in Panama, but if you read the newspaper stories in December and the month following, you saw pictures of our troops returning "mission accomplished."

□ 1240

We have imposed democracy. Our troops are out. However, that has not been true. Our troops never have been removed, and they better not be. There will not be one American life safe, I will tell Members that now.

Now, is that success? What about Noriega, Gen. Manuel Antonio Noriega? Is he a prisoner of war? If so, what war? If he is, then we ought to be obeying the Geneva Convention. We are not. Is he then a prisoner for the purposes of trial in our domestic court? If so, we are in gross violation of the basic international laws of sovereignty. Like it or not, he was a head of what we said was a sovereign nation.

Honduras, we are in occupation of Honduras, still. However, let us go back to these basic things. What is the purpose of our intervention? Once that purpose becomes military, what is the mission of our military? What is the mission of the military? There was a time in 1987 when plans were elaborately drawn up for the invasion of Nicaragua. Fortunately, our professional military, to their everlasting glory, were able to prevail and say, "Hey, this is what it will take, and we have our limitations as a military. We can achieve our military goals if we spell out the mission, but this is what it is going to take."

Now, what do we do afterwards? Who is going to govern Nicaragua? Unless our troops are there to impose that government as we have in Panama? Fortune prevailed. In this case today, unfortunately, the administration has a political general, as a Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and that is bad. Throughout our history, in which the basic understanding is that we have a people's army. We were not going to have standing armies like the kings of Europe were accustomed to. We also were not going to have king-made wars. This is a reason why this provision was a most debated provision. If Members look at the annals and the record of the proceedings of the Constitutional Convention, the most feared power was to give any man, call him chief magistrate, as they first did in the Convention, or President, as they finally ended up doing, or call him king. They did not want to be victimized any more by king-made wars. So, they said only "the Congress," as a direct agent and representative of the people shall have the power to declare war. It has the power to raise armies, and money for the purposes therefor.

Not the President. However, we live in a day and time when the President says, "I'm the Commander in Chief of the country." He is not. He is the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States, and that is all. This is where the Congress comes in, and the Congress is just about to, once again, cravenly try to have it both ways as we have it, and the Congress has had it since Korea.

When President Truman ordered the Armed Forces of the United States, based on a then conscription service draft, he acted contrary to the basic peacetime draft triggered by the declaration in December 1941, and forced unwilling Americans to serve outside of the continental United States without a declaration of war or "expressly provided by the Congress."

There were the phrases that had to be placed in the first peacetime draft law in 1940, and redefined in 1941, but we had Congresses then that did not have the key, so those Members said, "All right, we will have for the first time a peacetime draft." Some are called, some are not called. Those that are called, we will have a Sailor and Soldier's Relief Act so that after their service they will have their job to come back to. If they are paying on a home, they shall not pay more than 6 percent. That is still the law. Let me assure Members, all of the financial entities are trying ways to get out of it.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing, that is exactly the appeal I have had from fellow Members just south of Washington, DC, in the State of Virginia, in areas where we have a concentration of military, or heavy concentration of those that have just been called in as reservists, because mortgage companies—both primary as well as secondary—are trying to get around it. However, those men who wrote that law were looking out for the people. Therefore, they sunset it. It would last only 1 year. Therefore, in the summer of 1941, when it was about to expire, they finally passed it by one vote, and only after a southern Member appended this phraseology.

Notwithstanding any of the herein-after above, no person subject to the terms of this act shall be compelled to serve against his will outside of the continental United States, except in a declaration of war, or expressly provided so by the Congress. Then it passed by one vote. Then a few months later, we had Pearl Harbor. Then we had a declaration of war the day after. However, everyone forgot about that when we were supposed to have won World War II. My whole thesis since I have come to the Congress in 1961 is that World War II has not ended. There was no peace treaty. Even now, we have over 325,000 military in Germany alone. Even now. The sequela war in Korea, that has not ended. Why? We have over 45,000 military in South

Korea, and if we add the 40,000 civilians with them, we have over 80,000 Americans in South Korea, even after we have had not one, but four violent demonstrations against our military presence in South Korea. What is the military mission of our military in South Korea? What is the military mission of our over 300,000 in Germany? Can we not see where we are headed, colleagues, when we talk about war?

Without the Congress even having had a chance or willing to, but wait until the President has preempted and co-opted anything. What are we going to do Friday? Say, "Oh, yes, Mr. President, we are in favor of the U.N. resolution"? Here is a President that advocated the United States getting out of the United Nations, just a few years ago. All of a sudden he is saying, "Hey, all I want you to do is just say 'Approve the U.N.'; that is, if Saddam Hussein does not get out of Kuwait by the 15th, then it will be all right for us to use force"?

Again, what is the military mission of our now close to 450,000 military in Saudi Arabia? What is their mission? Is it to go in and roll back Iraq from Kuwait? And then what? Leave Saddam and his warmaking capability intact? Well, then you have other imponderables, you have other countries like Israel, that might have a word or two about that.

□ 1240

You know, after all, just about 3 weeks ago Israel blew up a missile. It did not bother to advise the United States. What was the meaning of that?

Well, anybody who knows the subject matter of the Middle East will tell you what the meaning was.

So what do we have at this moment? Let us put aside the question of what is the military mission. In effect, what we have done, Mr. President, is that you have exchanged about 200 or 250 civilian workers, most of them oil corporation employees, if not all, so-called hostages, for 450,000 of our soldiers as hostages. They are now hostage to the dictates, the caprice, the whims of other rulers and other nations.

Mr. President, by getting personal and even Colin Powell making speeches in September and October against Saddam Hussein, since when have we had a Joint Chief getting into the political arena like that?

But above all, Mr. President, why do you want to reduce yourself to name calling with a guy like Saddam Hussein to the same level? I do not understand.

But what have we done? We have got 450,000, close to that by now. That is like if you have the city of Seattle and moved it into the middle of the desert. That is what we have done.

The ecological impact will be absolutely catastrophic in that area, the most sensitive ecologically speaking.

In the meanwhile, one of my colleagues, a very distinguished Member, honored, mentioned, "Oh, please don't make this an American war." It is. You are not going to have a Russian soldier shooting an Arab Muslim. You are not going to have a German soldier in there shooting at an Arab Muslim. It will be an American soldier, and when we do, this notion that it is going to be a limited war 6 days a week, and I was horrified when I heard my distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee say last night on TV that he feels sure the casualties would not exceed several thousands, which was acceptable. Acceptable to whom? Nothing is acceptable when you have an unnecessary war.

If ever the history books will record, as surely as I am speaking, that this was the most of unnecessary wars, this will be one, if it reaches that point.

Frankly, you have got to be realistic. Where else are we headed?

So the issue is not going to be, Mr. President, hey, you come over here and consult. The issue is going to be, are you loyal to the President or are you not loyal to the President? And of course, the options are gone. Why? Because you now have 450,000 of our soldiers in those sands. What are you going to do, deny them money, deny them arms?

The Congress wants to have it both ways. It wants to sit back, as they have done since August, and say, "Well, let's see how it works out and then if it doesn't work out, we jump on the President."

Well, let me tell you something, my colleagues. You could do that in the fifties. You could do that in the sixties and you could do that even with the little excursions of Mr. Reagan in which we lost two aviators going out to try to kill Qadhafi, and let me point out to you that Qadhafi is still alive and in power, and in fact, has made more treaties than he ever had before with the surrounding Arabic, Islamic world.

Let me tell you by way of conclusion, if hostilities break out, you will not confine them.

It is like a revolution. Once it starts, there is nobody can tell you how many are going to get killed or where it is going to end up.

So what is the military mission? You are going in, roll back Iraq, for what, Kuwait? That will arouse the Muslim world to a unity they have never had, and particularly the Arab Muslims and the Islamic world, the entire Islamic world. It will not be confined to the Middle East. It will be worldwide.

Pakistan has the bomb. Let me assure you, it will be more likely than not they will let them have it in the Middle East.

Second, is the military mission then not only to roll back from Kuwait, but go in and destroy Saddam Hussein and

his war power machinery? What about after?

What will that do to the Arabic Islamic fundamentalist movement, including Iran?

We have already had a clear demonstration. We had the two countries that had been locked in the most murderous, the most bloody war in the 20th century, Iraq and Iran. Iraq ended up victorious. We helped them and others. They ended up with over 5,500 tanks. They ended up with what started out as 2 and now 35 crack brigades, called the Republican Brigades, crack. They fought in that desert. They died in that desert. They know it. And they have a million-man army, a million. When they started out in the war against Iran, it wasn't even a fifth. Iran had to plea for armistice; but after the invasion of Kuwait, Saddam Hussein had the agility on the basis of the Islamic brotherhood to bring in the Islamic leaders in Iran and proclaim a sort of fellowship. That ought to signify something to our geopoliticians; but instead of this, and I will conclude, let me tell you what you are facing.

Did we go in to protect oil, as it was first said on August 3? If so, once hostilities break out, let me tell you what we are going to face. We are going to face \$80 a barrel oil; but more importantly, our geopoliticians somehow or other, talking about backed-up policies, and if they have trouble with the Saudi kings, are prepared to talk about deposing and installing a more democratic government. The Saudi kings are informed of that, so being true born as they are of that great tribe of Arabs known as Bedouins, have mined the oil pipelines. They are all dynamited. Their production is very simple. If we go, the oil lines go with us.

So many friends, what is it that we want our military to do? What is their military mission, Mr. President?

Have we not learned anything in our past ventures from Korea, to Vietnam, to Central America, once we summoned the military?

I spoke for 14 months after President Reagan detailed the marines to Beirut and I asked that simple question. What is their military mission?

Finally, at a press conference he said they are there as peacekeepers and to shore up the Gemayel regime. I then took the floor, and anybody who wants to and is interested in looking at the record instead of what I am saying now, and I said if that is the case, they cannot be peacekeepers because the Gemayel regime is one of four factions bitterly fighting. You cannot come in on the side of one and be a peacekeeper.

Second, they are militarily exposed. They are in a saucer bowl bottom with the rim full of hostile forces.

□ 1300

Well, the rest is history. But who is thinking of the 241 marines who died in that excursion? What was the military purpose?

The marines are not, the soldiers are not politicians; they are not diplomats, they are warriors, and always it has been true since—and these are the words I used on October 28, the last day of the session, at 3 a.m. in the morning, when I said: "If the trumpet giveth an uncertain sound, who then shall be prepared to do battle?"

HOUSE COMMISSION ON CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MORAN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution to establish a House Commission on Congressional Reform. The Commission would be made up of 12 former Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker and the minority leader, and would be charged with developing, over a 6-month period, recommendations that would enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of the House, and improve its capacity for lawmaking, oversight, and representation.

The time has come to take a good look at the House of Representatives. The American public has a deep and growing dissatisfaction with this body. While there has historically been no shortage of critics of Congress, recent public opinion polls suggests that Congress' approval rating has dropped to a low point in recent memory. The calls for term limitations for incumbents reflect this dissatisfaction, but I believe they address the symptoms and not the underlying ills of this body. It is time to reexamine the operations of the House, and close the public confidence gap.

At the same time when the Congress is being looked to as a pattern by emerging democracies in Eastern Europe and around the world, the American people are finding serious fault with the body. Recent public opinion polls have found an approval rating of only 24 percent. There is concern that Congress is unable to address the pressing problems of the day in a responsible manner. There is concern that the view of the American people are not adequately represented in the legislative process. An increasing number of our constituents perceive Congress as irrelevant. And since we are a democratic body entrusted to represent our constituents and guide this Nation through the perils of the modern world, this is a serious indictment.

The resolution that I offer today is not meant to add to the criticism of Congress. Instead, it is directed at the

opposite result. I have great respect for the qualifications and commitment, the dedication and sense of duty, of the Members of the House of Representatives. I have been privileged to serve with men and women who have made great contributions to this Nation, both individually and collectively. Many of the depictions of the House in the media disregard the positive aspects of Congress. But this body can work better. I believe that we can all agree on that.

The time has come for a comprehensive reexamination of the structural and institutional aspects of the House. It is not just our prerogative to make the House more responsive to the people, it is our obligation. By enhancing the operations and effectiveness of the House, I believe that we can strengthen public confidence in the institution.

Why should we look to an outside commission for recommendations on enhancing the performance of the House of Representatives? One reason is common to all institutions—it is difficult for sitting members of an institution to offer an objective and impartial review of its own operations. A second reason is the demands of Members' schedules, which are substantial. Representatives today simply cannot devote full time to one issue. A subject as complex as improving the legislative process requires the thorough and thoughtful study and reflection that only those with experience and time can bring to the task.

Congress does and should devote the bulk of its energy to addressing the pressing substantive matters—such as the events in the Persian Gulf today—while a commission could focus exclusively on improving the institution of the House of Representatives itself. To be sure, many legislative interests are involved when Congress addresses various reforms. A commission made up of a select group of former Members, who do not have a personal stake in the outcome of reform, can develop fair and objective recommendations for change.

The Commission could, for instance, take a fresh look at the area of campaign financing reform, a topic that has seemed intractable in recent years. Developing a reasonable solution to campaign financing would be enough in itself to justify the Commission. And the Commission would not postpone, but instead would supplement the efforts of House committees with jurisdiction over this and other areas. The resolution specifically provides that the Commission's recommendations are to be referred to the appropriate House committees for consideration.

The crux of the House Commission on Congressional Reform, its essential element, is that it is comprised of former Members of the House of Representatives. Commission members would have a perspective only obtained

through service in this body—they would understand the imperatives of the election process, the operations of committees, procedures on the floor, legislative time pressures, and the many other facets of the job of U.S. Representative. Some Commission members would likely have experienced the successes and failure of past efforts to enhance the operations of the House, and could bring this to bear on today's Congress.

Several former Members, men and women who had distinguished careers in the House and who have a wealth of knowledge about this institution, come immediately to mind. House alumni such as Richard Bolling and Barber Conable, Tip O'Neill and Mel Laird, Robert Giaino and John Rhodes, William Brodhead and Ed Bethune are among the many potential Commission members. Some members could even be drawn from those who have just recently left the House, such as Lindy Boggs or Bill Frenzel. Of course, it would be up to the Speaker and the minority leader to appoint Commission members, but the Commission could represent a cross-section of the geographic and political spectrum—north to south, east to west, liberal to conservative.

The common denominator would be that these former Members would understand the day-to-day reality of House membership, would care deeply about the integrity of the institution, and would recognize that there are fundamental problems that need to be addressed.

The House Commission on Congressional Reform would conduct a careful and thorough review of the operations of the House, and function in a non-partisan manner. Public dissatisfaction with Congress makes it clear that improving the way Congress works would advance the interests of both parties. Increased partisanship in the House will only cause a further decline in the American people's confidence in their elected leaders.

During the great debates preceding the Civil War, Abraham Lincoln said of the union, "a house divided against itself cannot stand." In the months ahead, if partisanship is allowed to divide this body and stifle the changes that are needed to make Congress more responsive to the American people, that division will imperil this House. The Commission, as an independent and nonpartisan group, could avoid the partisan wrangling that can delay needed changes.

Critics of some past efforts to examine the operations of Congress saw reform efforts as a misplaced search for structural solutions to what were at their core political problems. The House Commission on Congressional Reform would avoid this because it would be composed of former Members of the House who would bring with

them a breadth and depth of historical understanding, practical experience, and institutional perspective. They would be aware of past efforts and would develop recommendations capable of mobilizing consensus and providing incentives for current Members to implement them.

The time has come for an independent review of the House of Representatives, and I hope that you will join me in support of the House Commission on Congressional Reform.

I ask unanimous consent to submit for the RECORD several articles that suggest the need for a House Commission on Congressional Reform.

H. RES. —

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

"House Commission on Congressional Reform Act."

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to address the need for a historical and institutional perspective on ways to improve the operation of the House of Representatives, to increase its responsiveness and efficiency, and to build its capacity for lawmaking, oversight, and representation.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT.

There is established a commission to be known as the House Commission on Congressional Reform (in this resolution referred to as the "Commission").

SEC. 4. DUTIES.

The Commission shall develop comprehensive and impartial recommendations for the House of Representatives that would improve—

- (1) institutional integrity,
- (2) accountability to the public,
- (3) efficiency,
- (4) effectiveness, and
- (5) any other aspects that would serve to increase public confidence in the House of Representatives.

SEC. 5. MEMBERSHIP

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commission shall be composed of 12 members.

(b) **APPOINTMENT.**—6 members of the Commission shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and 6 members shall be appointed by the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives.

(2) **REQUIREMENTS FOR MEMBERS.**—An individual appointed under subsection (b) shall have served in the House of Representatives, and shall not be a Member of the 102d Congress.

(d) **VACANCIES.**—A vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

(e) **QUORUM.**—8 members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

(4) **CHAIRPERSON; VICE CHAIRPERSON.**—The Chairperson and Vice Chairperson shall be designated by the Speaker and the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives at the time of appointment.

(g) COMPENSATION.—

(1) **MEMBERS.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), members of the Commission shall each be paid at a rate equal to the rate of pay for level III of the Executive Schedule for each day (including travel time) during which they are engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission.

(2) **EXCEPTION.**—Members of the Commission who are full-time officers or employees of the United States shall receive no additional pay or compensation, except for nec-

essary travel expenses, by reason of their service on the Commission.

(h) **EXPENSES.**—Subject to the adoption of expense resolutions as required by clause 5 of rule XI of the Rules of the House, the Commission may incur expenses in connection with its functions under this resolution.

SEC. 6. DIRECTOR AND STAFF OF COMMISSION; EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.

(a) **DIRECTOR.**—The Commission shall, without regard to section 5311(b) of title 5, United States Code, have a Director appointed by the Commission and paid at the rate of basic pay for level III of the Executive Schedule.

(b) **APPOINTMENT AND PAY OF STAFF.**—The Commission may appoint personnel as it considers appropriate without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments to the competitive service. The staff of the Commission shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, related to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

(c) **EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.**—The Commission may procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code.

(d) **STAFF OF GENERAL SUPPORT OFFICES OF CONGRESS.**—Upon request of the Commission, the head of any general support office of the Congress of the United States is authorized to detail, on a reimbursable basis, any of the personnel of that office to the Commission to assist the Commission in carrying out its duties under this resolution.

SEC. 7. POWERS OF COMMISSION.

(a) **HEARINGS.**—The Commission may, for the purpose of this resolution, sit and act at the times and places, take testimony, and receive evidence, as the Commission considers appropriate.

(b) **INFORMATION.**—The Commission may secure directly from any Committee, Subcommittee, or support office of the House of Representatives information necessary to enable it to carry out this Act.

(c) **MAILS.**—The Commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as departments and agencies of the United States.

(d) **SUPPORT SERVICES.**—The Administrator of General Services shall provide to the Commission, on a reimbursable basis, administrative support services as the Commission may request.

SEC. 8. REPORTS.

(a) **REPORTING REQUIREMENT.**—The Commission shall transmit to the Speaker and Minority Leader of the House of Representatives its recommendations not later than 6 months after the date of passage of this resolution, and the Speaker shall refer these recommendations to the Committees of the House of Representatives with jurisdiction over the matters covered for appropriate action. The report shall contain a detailed statement of the findings and conclusions of the Commission, together with specific recommendations and implementing language for the legislative or administrative action it considers appropriate.

SEC. 9. TERMINATION.

The Commission shall cease to exist 90 days after submitting its report pursuant to section 8.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 6, 1991]

HOW TO FIX CONGRESS—ADVICE FROM THE ALUMNI

(By David S. Broder)

The alumni are worried that dear old Alma Mater is getting a bad name. It's the Con-

gress of the United States we're talking about, not Old Siwash or Winslow or Euphoria State. Interviews with more than a score of former representatives and senators, Republicans and Democrats alike, show a bad case of anxiety about the "rep" that Congress has these days.

A Republican, former representative William H. Hudnut III, now mayor of Indianapolis, said the public has the impression that Congress "is a rudderless ship, that its members are squabbling all the time, and that they are afraid to bite any bullets or make any hard choices."

A Democrat, former Illinois representative Abner J. Mikva, now a federal circuit court judge in Washington, pointed to the decline in reelection margins and the passage of term-limitation measures last November and said of his former colleagues: "If they can't read that handwriting on the wall, they need eyeglasses for sure."

That refrain is voiced all across the political spectrum, from liberals like Adlai E. Stevenson III, John C. Culver and Gary Hart to conservatives like John J. Rhodes, Melvin R. Laird and James T. Broyhill.

Former Senate Republican leader Howard H. Baker Jr., of Tennessee, whose father, mother and father-in-law all served in Congress before him, summed up the general sentiment by saying, "I've seen Congress's reputation go up and down for many, many years. But I've never seen it lower than it is now. I think there will be a massive wave of anti-incumbent sentiment unless the problem is addressed."

The definition of "the problem" varies from person to person. And when the old grads are asked what practical steps Congress could take to improve its standing with the public, they offer a variety of suggestions. But in this unscientific sampling of notable alumni, the single action most often mentioned is to change the way the campaigns for Congress are financed.

"I cannot say how important I think it is," said former representative Dick Bolling, who believes that financing lies at the heart of most of Congress's other problems. Agreeing, former senator Thomas Eagleton said, "I don't care what ethics bills you pass, if you don't do anything about campaign-spending reform, you haven't done anything at all."

Bolling and Eagleton are both liberal Democrats from Missouri. But this is no longer just a liberal lament. Former Nevada senator Paul Laxalt, the chairman of Ronald Reagan's presidential campaigns, said, "There's far too much emphasis on money and far too much time spent collecting it. It's the most corrupting thing I see on the congressional scene."

Laxalt said, "The problem is so bad we ought to start thinking about federal financing" of House and Senate campaigns. "It was anathema to me," as it has been to most conservatives, he said, "but in my experience with the [Reagan] presidential campaigns, it worked, and it was like a breath of fresh air. . . . A lot of us who retired [from Congress] did so because we just didn't have the stomach to go out and hustle for money the way you have to do now."

Hudnut, also an opponent of public financing in his House days, agrees with Laxalt now—and also favors caps on campaign spending, a provision that congressional Republicans and President Bush have adamantly opposed. "It's obscene how money is driving politics," Hudnut exclaimed.

Former House speaker Thomas P. (Tip) O'Neill of Massachusetts also is angry about former colleagues who "pile up a million or

more bucks" in campaign funds—and then dare anyone to challenge them. "It's good for people to have a challenger, to have to come home and explain their records," O'Neill said. "Otherwise, they get arrogant, they go international, they forget the people at home."

It's not just the amount of money enveloping Congress that concerns these alumni; many also object to the kind of campaigns being waged. "The negative campaigning and the smears," exclaimed former senator Abraham A. Ribicoff (D) of Connecticut. "It's no wonder they have so little respect for Congress when people see the candidates for Congress stooping to these tactics. The attitude is simple disgust."

Two prominent Republican alumni—former senator Bill Brock of Tennessee and former representative Melvin R. Laird of Wisconsin—argue that the best way to insulate Congress from special-interest PAC (political-action committee) money is to route all such campaign funds through the parties. Laird argues that most organized giving today is "really to buy access" to the lawmakers. Brock, a former national GOP chairman, agrees that following the PACs to contribute only to the parties would reduce the access game—and strengthen party discipline.

Tighter party control is necessary if Congress is to tackle the tough problems, several alumni say. "When I was in Congress, we had a lot of party discipline," former New Hampshire representative Perkins Bass (R) said. "There's no discipline I can see today." Pointing to the rank-and-file House rebellion that autumn against the budget agreement endorsed by leaders of both parties, Bass said, "Congress can't take on the entitlements or the other tough budget choices, because there's no discipline."

On the opposite coast, Washington Lt. Gov. Joel Pritchard (R), who served for 12 years in the House, remarked that "in Congress today, everyone runs for office as a political entity of his own. Without a strong party connection, there's no coherent philosophy for them to connect to; it's everyone for himself."

Others who agree that Congress needs more discipline think it has to come from inside the institution. Former House majority whip Tony Coelho (D) of California said, "The reforms that came in after the 1974 election spread out the power so much in Congress that it's very difficult for the leadership to lead. It's frustrated efforts at leadership and actually encouraged them to avoid responsibility."

Brock and Stevenson, Ribicoff and former senator James R. Pearson (R) of Kansas were partners in Senate reform efforts, several years apart. Today they still think internal changes clarifying lines of responsibility and reclaiming the leaders' and committee chairmen's vanished clout would enable Congress to do its job better. Congress, said Stevenson, "is suffering from an excess of democracy," Brock said. "They have to restore the authority of committee chairmen and get some hierarchical structure."

Two respected alumni argue that Congress might be more respected if its members just buckled down and worked harder at their jobs. "More work by individual senators is needed, and less reliance on staff," said former Senate majority leader Mike Mansfield (D) of Montana. "Congress should not be taking all of August off each year. And it ought to work five days a week to keep the legislation from piling up."

Former senator Margaret Chase Smith (R) of Maine, who prided herself on not missing

a roll-call vote, said, "Congress can't do its work with the amount of absenteeism there is. The public thinks they think about holidays and salaries than they do about passing legislation."

But Howard Baker takes exactly the opposite view. "They ought to reduce sessions to six months a year, so they have time to know what their constituents are thinking. Congress is not acting in the role the Constitution prescribes for it. It is meant to be essentially a big national board of directors, making broad policy, but increasingly it's becoming an elected bureaucracy with its fingers into everything."

However long the sessions or the workdays, several alumni say Congress has to organize its time better. Slashing staff, cutting the number of committees and subcommittees—and thereby reducing the schedule conflicts for individual members—were suggested by many of those interviewed. Former senator Charles McC. Mathias (R) of Maryland said, "Modern times have imposed a massive workload on Congress and it requires discipline. Not new rules, but enforcing the rules they've got would speed up things enormously."

Summarizing suggestions made by several others, former senator Daniel J. Evans (R) of Washington, who opted out after only one term, called for a two-year budget cycle, with the first year setting spending priorities and the second focusing on oversight of how the funds are being spent. Evans also favored "slashing severely" at the committee and staff undergrowth and scheduling significant floor debates for late afternoon and early evening hours to increase senatorial attendance. "If you had real debate," he said, "it would help educate the public on these issues, but we have virtually none of that now."

It has struck many of the alumni that one reason for Congress's bad reputation is that so many members bad-mouth Congress in their own reelection campaigns. "I think members of Congress are basically solid and sound," said former senator Robert Stafford (R) of Vermont. "But every two years, they spend all their time telling the public what bores their colleagues are at best, and what crooks at worst. No wonder the public believes it."

Others, however, say the character problem is not just a campaign myth—and must be addressed before Congress' reputation can improve.

"When I started," said John Rhodes of Arizona, the former House minority leader, "we had a feeling we had to be concerned about the country. But now I think there are more and more members who are primarily concerned about their own reelection. We used to say, 'You only have one political death, but you can choose when to use it.' They don't want to risk [anything] at all."

Former senator Gary Hart (D) of Colorado also draws a sharp contrast between the older members who were around when he came in 1974 and the younger ones who entered in the 1980s. "It has gone down in terms of caliber, breadth of vision and quality," he said. "It's going to be hard to get back to the broadgauge, big-picture, constitutional type of senator; they don't run in the kind of election campaigns we have today."

Former senator William Proxmire (D) of Wisconsin, a maverick who prided himself on his low-cost campaigns, is critical of the focus on reelection. "Being a senator is such a marvelous job," he said, "they do whatever they can to hold onto it. It becomes a prior-

ity for them, and their families, and their staffs, and even their colleagues pressure them, because their chairmanships depend on their party staying in control. And once the No. 1 objective becomes being reelected, you can rationalize all sorts of things . . ."

If reelection pressures are the problem, is term-limiting the answer? Some alumni say yes. Conservatives Broyhill and Hudnut are for the idea, and so is liberal former representative Shirley Chisholm (D) of New York. "There's anger and a lack of trust I've not seen before," she said, describing her sense of the public attitude toward Congress. "We need new blood—a new transfusion. Too many of them have Potomac fever and forgot how they got there."

But even those who voluntarily cut short their own congressional careers tend to reject the idea of limiting tenure by law. "When you decrease the tenure," said Rhodes, "the influence of unelected staff members goes up." Laird calls term limits "a repudiation of our whole philosophy of representative government." Former representative James R. Jones (D), whose home state of Oklahoma has passed term-limits for the legislature, calls them "crazy," but adds, "The only way to avoid them is for members of Congress to start acting as if the Constitution already included a limit on terms. If they would show more courage and candor, it would do wonders."

Finally, some alumni suggest that the public itself may have to take responsibility for Congress and its flaws. "From my perspective," said John Culver, "term-limitation is the latest manifestation of public irresponsibility. Many people don't vote. Most of those who do vote don't want to vote against their own congressman. So they look on term-limitations as a way of changing people without the bother—or the responsibility—of voting them out."

Culver said he agreed that today's Congress—"made up of wonderfully attractive people"—seems "more preoccupied with reelection than the old Congresses made up of people who were, frankly, less than distinguished." But, he said, "an informed electorate is the cornerstone of a democracy, and that's the responsibility of the people, not of the members of Congress. In the end, the public is going to get what it demands. This Congress is about what the people deserve—maybe a little better."

[From the Congressional Monitor, Dec. 17, 1990]

VETERAN MEMBERS CITE ILLS OF CONGRESS

As the 101st Congress two months ago struggled to complete its work, the American electorate and many members had this question on their minds: What on earth is wrong with Congress?

Members strode to the chamber microphones day after day to report with frustration that their constituents were demanding to know why Congress couldn't get anything done.

Years of divided government, an overemphasis by members on re-election campaigns, and major changes in the budget-making process and congressional power structure were among the key culprits cited by veteran lawmakers during recent interviews.

"I think it's getting worse, much worse," said retiring Sen. Gordon J. Humphrey, R-N.H.

Term Limits: "Serving in Congress has become much too valued by incumbents because the pay is so high and the prerequisites are so great," and members are

putting their re-elections ahead of the country, Humphrey said. "That's why I'm beating the drums" for term limits.

When members stay too long, "you lose your perspective; you lose your idealism," said Humphrey, who came to the Senate in 1979 and is leaving Washington for a seat in the New Hampshire Senate.

Retiring Sen. William L. Armstrong, R-Colo., who also started his Senate service in 1979, also suggested term limitations as a solution to some of Congress' problems. If members knew they had only a certain amount of time on Capitol Hill, he said, "it would change the whole focus of their work here."

Campaign Demands: Rep. Neal Smith, D-Iowa, who came to Congress in 1959, cited modern House campaigns as a significant factor in Congress' disabilities. "The cost of campaigns is so great," he said, requiring members to fly home to their districts frequently for appearances.

Demanding re-election campaigns, however, constitute only one of many hurdles to efficiency and progress in Congress, members said.

Budget Morass: Senators and House members in both parties blamed the 1974 budget act, which overhauled congressional budget procedures, for the type of struggles that impeded congressional and White House efforts to craft a deficit-reduction package this year.

That law requires Congress to adopt a budget resolution with spending and taxation targets before passing its annual authorization and appropriations bills, and sets deadlines for action on various aspects of the budget-writing process. But it contains many loopholes, members pointed out.

"I thought it was a good idea and voted for it, much to my regret," Rep. James H. Quillen, Tenn., ranking Republican on the House Rules Committee, said of the 1974 budget bill.

This year was even worse than usual, Quillen said, with "Republicans fighting Republicans, Democrats fighting Democrats, and very few supporting the president." The lawmaker said, "I think it's definitely the change in the system."

Like others, though, Quillen expressed little optimism for change in the near future. "It would take something spectacular," he said, such as automatic, across-the-board budget cuts kicking in and the government coming to a standstill for weeks.

Smith, chairman of the House Appropriations State, Justice, Commerce Subcommittee, also complained that the current budget process delays work on the spending plans, and cited the White House-congressional budget summit as a troublesome impediment.

The summit involved the White House in the appropriations process "at a lower level. It's not supposed to work that way," Smith said, adding that the White House should not step into the debate until the end.

Rep. Edward Madigan, R-Ill., said, "One of the best things that could be done would be to repeal the budget act."

Smith and others also cited a recent history of divided government, with Republicans holding the White House and Democrats controlling Congress, as a source of problems: "They're [the American public] not quite sure that they want either party to have full responsibility. . . . It's not an accident when they vote that way 20 years out of 24," said Smith.

Cumbersome Structure: The revamped budget process was not the only internal

congressional change that muddled the legislative waters, some longtime members said. Quillen complained that too many subcommittees have been created, spreading the power among too many lawmakers: "You get a lot of fingers in the pie."

"Back 28 years ago you had committee chairmen who ruled the rules. They ruled with an iron fist," Quillen said. Now, he said, there are "too many warring too much power. It's been diluted."

And Armstrong, noting a larger bureaucracy in Congress, said, "I guess I think things are a little bit more tangled up than they used to be."

Those tangles are not limited to the budget area. Armstrong said. For example, senators don't look at the qualifications of presidential nominees anymore, he complained, but end up "arguing with him or her about the details of how they're going to do the job." It gets to "the level of the absurd," he said.

President's Fault? While President Bush and many voters blamed Congress for a lack of leadership in this year's budget follies, lawmakers in both parties leveled the same charge at the president, saying he was at least partly responsible for the budget gridlock.

"I really don't blame members as much as I blame the presidency," said Rep. Patricia Schroeder, D-Colo., who has served in the House since 1973.

Many members of Bush's own party complained that he had abandoned the party's traditional themes—particularly its opposition to higher taxes—for his own political gain. Humphrey complained of "a lack of leadership" from the president, who he said tried to bury the differences between the two parties, causing other Republicans to suffer.—By Dinah Wisenberg.

[From the Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report, Oct. 27, 1990]

ADJOURNMENT: PUBLIC'S PATIENCE WEARS THIN AS CONGRESS WINDS DOWN (By Janet Hook)

The adjournment of the 101st Congress may bring a cease-fire in the months-long war between Congress and the White House, but it will send lawmakers out to face another formidable adversary: an increasingly hostile electorate.

At the end of the session, Congress may be able to take pride in enactment of a sweeping rewrite of the Clean Air Act, a politically popular child-care bill and a five-year deficit-reduction plan.

But those accomplishments may be lost on voters disgusted by the spectacle of budget paralysis, ethics scandals and political flip-flops that have eroded the credibility of government throughout the 101st Congress.

The long-delayed adjournment is itself a dubious distinction: At least in the postwar era, Congress has never been in session this close to Election Day. Three times since World War II Congress has adjourned 17 days before voters went to the polls. The 101st Congress passed that milestone when it stayed in session beyond Oct. 21.

101ST CONGRESS IN MICROCOSM

Final approval of the painstakingly wrought budget deal was the most daunting hurdle to be cleared before Congress could adjourn. But as the budget negotiations dragged on, other obstacles were knocked down. Appropriations bills cleared one by one. Other major bills with de facto "must-pass" status moved: clean air, housing and farm bills.

In some ways, the final days before adjournment were emblematic of the entire two-year term of the 101st Congress.

The Congress that was replete with sex scandals, investigations and resignations ended with five senators facing ethics hearings in November and a House member, Donald E. "Buz" Lukens, R-Ohio, suddenly quitting Oct. 24 after sexual misconduct charges.

The Congress that couldn't override President Bush's vetoes ended with the Senate sustaining his veto of contested civil rights legislation by one vote.

And the Congress that spent months consumed by the government's budget crisis was careerling from one missed deadline to the next until the very last week.

But for all the preoccupation with austerity, the Congress that began with a noisy fight over a government pay increase ended with lawmakers getting a quiet raise. As of Jan. 1, members will get a cost-of-living increase tied to the 4.1 percent hike for federal workers. House members also will get the 25 percent hike they approved in late 1989 when they forswore honoraria, barring a last-minute reversal. Although senators will make less, salaries in both chambers will shoot over the \$100,000 mark.

HANDICAPPER'S NIGHTMARE

As the week of Oct. 22 began, adjournment seemed like a mirage, an inviting image that evaporated each time Congress approached it. As one Senate aide put it, "This is the last week, but it may be two weeks long."

Rep. John P. Murtha, D-Pa., hedged his bet when he put money into a pool on when Congress would adjourn. His optimistic money was on Oct. 27, 11:59 p.m., he placed a second bet on a Dec. 23 adjournment.

The pessimist looked like the wise man Oct. 23, when a meeting of House Democrats disclosed a deep rupture in the party over how to proceed in the budget talks. That was a dark stroke in an already grim picture of disintegrating consensus: Republicans have been scrapping with each other for months. Bush was deriding Democrats on the campaign trail, and emergency funding of the government was about to expire at midnight Oct. 24.

But as the prospect of another government shutdown loomed, the political ground shifted, Democrats, having enjoyed a stunning political reversal that put Bush and the GOP on the defense in recent months, finally decided it was time to stop pressing their advantage and go home. They dropped their insistence on a surtax for millionaires, and Republican leaders begged Bush to accept a proffered compromise.

Although the end was in sight, that wasn't enough to put a floor under the public's plummeting confidence in Congress. A Wall Street Journal/NBC poll published Oct. 26 found that 71 percent of those questioned disapproved of Congress' role in the budget affair.

But getting the budget deal through and completing the pileup of other business pushed Congress into another weekend session. That was the latest—and with luck the last—in a string of protracted workweeks that have kept lawmakers from home-state constituents, campaigning and contributors.

Rep. George "Buddy" Darden, D-Ga., missed his three major campaign events this fall, including one held without him the day the House held 19 back-to-back roll call votes. Legislative business forced Rep. W.G. "Bill" Hefner, D-N.C., to miss a big fundraiser; but at least his featured guest, House

Speaker Thomas S. Foley of Washington, could go ahead without him.

With public hostility lapping at the shores of Capitol Hill, gallows humor became the order of the day for lawmakers resigned to the protracted session.

Rep. William Lehman, D-Fla., likes to tell his colleagues that he ran for Congress in 1972 because he wanted to move up into a more respectable profession. Now, he says, he thinks he'd get more public esteem if he went back to his old job; selling used cars.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CAMP) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WELDON, for 60 minutes, on January 10.

Mr. WOLF, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. GEKAS, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. EDWARDS of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SANDERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. McDERMOTT, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHEUER, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. KANJORSKI, for 60 minutes, on January 10, 11, and 12.

Mr. SKAGGS, for 30 minutes, on January 10.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CAMP) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DORNAN of California.

Mr. GINGRICH.

Mr. BEREUTER.

Mr. HORTON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. EDWARDS of Texas) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. TORRES.

Mr. TRAFICANT.

Mr. BONIOR.

Mr. CLEMENT.

Mr. JOCOBS.

Mr. STARK in three instances.

Mr. WEISS in two instances.

Mr. STUDDS.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, January 10, 1991, at 12 noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

222. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting FmHA single family housing legal services contracting activities, fiscal year 1990, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 1480(d); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

223. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a report on a plan for a comprehensive and workable plan for the abatement of lead-based paint in privately owned housing, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 4822; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

224. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notice of the Department of the Navy's proposed letter(s) of offer and acceptance [LOA] to Singapore for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 91-13), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

225. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed license for the export of major defense equipment sold commercially to Iceland (transmittal No. DTC-13-90), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

226. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed license for the export of defense equipment sold commercially to Saudi Arabia (Transmittal No. DTC-9-91), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

227. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, notification of a proposed license for the export of defense equipment sold commercially to Israel (Transmittal No. DTC-12-91), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

228. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Education, a report covering the disposal of surplus Federal real property for education by individual transactions from October 1, 1989, through September 30, 1990; to the Committee on Government Operations.

229. A letter from the Chairman, Administrative Conference of the United States, transmitting a report of the agency's compliance with the requirements of the internal accounting and administrative control system, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

230. A letter from the executive secretary, Barry M. Goldwater Scholarship and Excellence in Education Foundation, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1990, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

231. A letter from the Director, Human Resources, Department of the Army, transmitting the annual report for the U.S. Army nonappropriated fund employee retirement plan for the year ended September 30, 1989, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9503(a)(1)(B); to the Committee on Government Operations.

232. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1990, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

233. A letter from the Department of Justice, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity

Act for fiscal year 1990, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

234. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of State, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1990, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

235. A letter from the President and CEO, Farm Credit System Assistance Board, transmitting a report of the agency's compliance with the requirements of the internal accounting and administrative control system, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

236. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Labor Relations Authority, transmitting a report of the agency's compliance with the requirements of the internal accounting and administrative control system, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

237. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting a report of the agency's compliance with the requirements of the internal accounting and administrative control system, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

238. A letter from the Director, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, transmitting a report of the agency's compliance with the requirements of the internal accounting and administrative control system, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

239. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting a copy of a report entitled, "Compliance With the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

240. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1990, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

241. A letter from the Executive Director, National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, transmitting a report of the agency's compliance with the requirements of the internal accounting and administrative control system, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

242. A letter from the National Endowment for the Humanities, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1990, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

243. A letter from the Acting Director, National Science Foundation, transmitting a report of the agency's compliance with the requirements of the internal accounting and administrative control system, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

244. A letter from the Administrator, Panama Canal Commission, transmitting a report of the agency's compliance with the requirements of the internal accounting and administrative control system, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

245. A letter from the Director, Peace Corps, transmitting a report of the agency's compliance with the requirements of the internal accounting and administrative control system, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

246. A letter from the Chairman, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting a report of the agency's compliance with the requirements of the internal accounting and administrative control system, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

247. A letter from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a report of the agency's compliance with the requirements of the internal accounting and administrative control system, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

248. A letter from the Director, The Federal Domestic Volunteer Agency, transmitting a report of the agency's compliance with the requirements of the internal accounting and administrative control system, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

249. A letter from the Director, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, transmitting a report of the agency's compliance with the requirements of the internal accounting and administrative control system, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

250. A letter from the Director, U.S. Office of Personnel Management, transmitting a report of the agency's compliance with the requirements of the internal accounting and administrative control system, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

251. A letter from the Director, U.S. Information Agency, transmitting a report of the agency's compliance with the requirements of the internal accounting and administrative control system, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

252. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting notice of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

253. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting notice of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

254. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting notice of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

255. A letter from the Paralyzed Veterans of America, transmitting a copy of the annual audit report of the Paralyzed Veterans of America for the fiscal year ended September 30, 1990, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 1166; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

256. A letter from the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., transmitting proceedings of the 38th National Convention of the Veterans of World War I of the United States, Inc., held in Cedar Rapids, IA, August 18-30, 1990, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 776; 44 U.S.C. 1332 (H. Doc. No. 102-25); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

257. A letter from the American Legion transmitting the proceedings of the 72d National Convention of the American Legion, held in Indianapolis, IN, August 28-30, 1990, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 49 (H. Doc. No. 102-26); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed.

258. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report on the limitation imposed on amounts of premium pay for overtime to any individual employed by, or assigned to, the Indian Health Service, pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 1611; jointly to the Committee on Energy and Commerce and Interior and Insular Affairs.

259. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the report on the nondisclosure of safeguards information for the quarter ending September 30, 1990, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2167(e); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Interior and Insular Affairs.

260. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting information on the assignment or detaching of GAO employees to congressional committees, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 734; jointly to the Committees on Government Operations and Appropriations.

261. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a study of volume performance standard rates of increase by geography, specialty, and type of service, pursuant to Public Law 101-239, section 6102(d)(3) (103 Stat. 2185); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[Omitted from the Record of Jan. 3, 1991]

Mr. GONZALEZ: Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs. Summary of Activities, a report of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, House of Representatives, 101st Congress, 2d Sess. (Rept. 101-1025). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DICKINSON:

H.R. 468. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to carry out a highway demonstration project in the vicinity of Montgomery, AL; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. HORTON (for himself, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. LENT, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. PETRI, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. HYDE, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. McGRATH, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. ROSE, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. ROE, Mr. ESPY, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WOLF, Mr. DICKS, Mr. REED, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York):

H.R. 469. A bill to provide automatic extensions of time for the filing of tax returns, and the performance of other tax-related acts, by members of the Armed Forces of the

United States serving in Operation Desert Shield; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VISCLOSKEY:

H.R. 470. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to release the restrictions, requirements, and conditions imposed in connection with the conveyance of certain lands in the city of Gary, IN; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. HERTEL:

H.J. Res. 59. Joint resolution to designate the week of February 10-16, 1991, as "Children of Substance Abuse Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

H.J. Res. 60. Joint resolution designating August 12 through 18, 1991, as "National Parents of Murdered Children Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT:

H.J. Res. 61. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States repealing the 22 article of amendment thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DYMALLY:

H. Con. Res. 22. Concurrent resolution condemning the deliberate and systematic activities of the military authority in Suriname to subvert constitutional democracy in that nation to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAHALL:

H. Con. Res. 23. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the necessity of allies of the United States paying their fair share of the costs associated with Operation Desert Shield; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WOLF:

H. Res. 26. Resolution to establish a Commission of the House of Representatives on Congressional Reform; jointly to the Committee on House Administration and Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. FISH introduced a bill (H.R. 471) for the relief of Fred M. Lombardi and Marguerite M. Lombardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 3: Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. BREWSTER, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. ROE, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. SKELTON, and Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado.

H.R. 303: Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. EVANS, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. WALKER, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. ROE, and Mrs. LOWEY of New York.

H.R. 321: Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. GEJDESON, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. LENT, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. WISE.

H.J. Res. 50: Mr. LEACH of Iowa.

H.J. Res. 58: Mr. BLILEY, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. McMILLEN of Mary-

land, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. ROSE, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. COYNE, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. TALLON, Mr. MFUME, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. WOLF, Ms. LONG, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. MCDADE, and Mr. FAZIO.

H. Con. Res. 1: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. SCHEUER, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mrs. MINK, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, and Mr. ESPY.

H. Con. Res. 19: Mrs. BOXER.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

8. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Ebenezer United Methodist Church, Washington, DC, relative to human rights in El Salvador; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

9. Also, petition of the city of Sweetwater, FL, relative to Puerto Rico's political future; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

10. Also, petition of the office of the Governor, State Capitol, Salem, OR, relative to a six-county pilot program that would substitute private and public sector jobs for current food stamp, AFDC, and unemployment insurance benefits; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Agriculture.